UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,779	06/18/2001	Daniel T. Johnson	6740.01	2427

25763 7590 02/10/2006

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
50 SOUTH SIXTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1498

EXAMINER	
POINVIL, FRANTZY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/883,779	JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Frantzy Poinvil	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed 12/27/2005.

2. The finality of the prior Office action has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Northington et al (US Patent No. 6,128,602).

As per claims 1-9, 11-18, 20-28, 30, 31 and 33-37, Northington et al disclose a system and method for the real-time consolidation of information from multiple financial systems. In so doing, Northington et al teach a system for managing a plurality of assets of a plurality of distributed enterprises and allowing a user to access asset information. See the abstract. Northington et al disclose a central processor, a database for storing and tracking asset information for the plurality of assets of the plurality of enterprises, the database in communication with the central processor wherein the central processor tracks information relevant to managing each of the assets. Applicant is directed to figures 1-3 and column 2, line 29 to column 4, line 20.

Northington et al. further teach the central processor includes a website hosted by at least one computer in communication with a computer network through a communication link, a client processor. See figures 1-3. The central processor automatically generates E-mail messages to a service provider in response to a service request by the user. See column 6, lines 23-40. The client processor inputs, queries and downloads asset information from the central processor through a web browser. The central processor is programmed with code for utilizing a user profile, including securable attributes, to limit access to particular asset information. See column 5, lines 35-56 and column 10, lines 14-38 and lines 56-65 of Northington et al. Northington et al further teach the asset interface communicates with the client processor through a wireless communication modality. Note column 5, lines 12-15.

Northington et al. also disclose calculating a total cost of ownership for a particular asset or group of assets by updating all transactions stored in the database. See column 13, lines 7-20 and column 16, lines 7-40.

Applicant's representative argues that Northington et al fail to teach or suggest managing a plurality of assets as claimed.

In response, while the preamble recites a system for managing a plurality of assets, there are no actual steps of managing of assets being recited in the body of the claims. The wherein clause recites "the central processor tracks information relevant to managing each of the plurality of assets". The wherein clause does not recite the central processor manages each of the plurality of assets. Even assuming that the claims were to recite steps or means for managing each of the plurality of assets, Northington et al clearly state in their abstract that:

"The system receives, processes and stores information obtained from a plurality of financial and/or other external computerized systems, and provides one or more authorized users with the ability to monitor financial transactions on-line and manipulate and control all financial transactions of the entity in real time using, for example, Web-browser software technology." .

and at column 6, lines 24-41:

"As shown in FIG. 1B, existing systems component 130 includes a general ledger system 131 and a plurality of division systems represented by elements 132, 133, and 134. The general ledger system 131 may maintain the overall financial records of the entity, while the division systems respectively maintain the financial records of divisions within the entity. Financial transactions maintained by the general ledger system 131 and division systems 132, 133, and 134 may include both financial transactions performed internally between two or more divisions within the entity as well as financial transactions performed between the entity and third parties. The system 100 may be implemented to track, store, and reconcile the financial transaction data maintained by the general ledger system 131 and division systems 132, 133 and 134 as described in additional detail below.".

From these passages, it is clearly comprehended that Northington et al teach all of the claimed features. The entities holding assets of Northington et al are similar to the claimed enterprises holding assets as claimed.

Assuming that functions of managing a plurality of assets were positively recited in the claims, the Examiner notes that Northington et al manage all types of assets (whether financial accounts, stocks) of an entity or enterprise. Using the system of Northington et al to also manage physical items owned by the same entity would have been obvious to do by the ordinary skill in

the art. The ordinary skill in the art would not have turned to another specific software for doing so. The one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to enter the related types of assets under the related categories that would have been needed so as to make their system practical and organized. Moreover, the type of assets being managed does not bring any unobviousness teachings over Northington et al as Northington et al do teach a plurality of manners to manage assets of an enterprise or entity.

Furthermore, in the system of Northington et al there are many types of assets classes which include many different types of assets. Thus, each of these asset classes or specific individual assets must have a unique identifier in order to analyze, track their performance. For example, most stocks have various types of unique identifiers, includig the name of the issuer, a cussip number and a registration number for tracking purposes. These identifiers will facilitate the storing, retrieving specific assets in a computer system. Various factors to monitoring and analyzing their performance include their percent yield, price/earnings ratio, dividends and net changes.

As per claims 10 and 32, Northington et al do not explicitly teach the central processor is programmed with code for generating a GIS map locating one of the plurality of enterprise assets. As per this feature, the enterprises or financial systems discussed in Northington et al may possess a plurality of different types of assets located in different geographic locations. Using a GIS map for locating assets is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a GIS map for locating assets if the enterprises own assets such as vehicles or transportation assets so as to be informed

of their location and conditions so as to better assess the total costs or values of all assets owned by the enterprise.

As per claim 19, Northington et al do not explicitly teach the user is an equipment manufacturer. The enterprises discussed in Northington et al may deal with a plurality of financial systems and equipment manufacturers. The user being an equipment manufacturer does not bring different functions in the system of Northington et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a user being an equipment manufacturer if the system of Northington et al is dealing with a manufacturer with the motivation to account to all types of assets and manufacturers of assets as would be desired.

As per claim 29, the client processor being a kiosk located at an enterprise is not explicitly stated in Northington et al. Northington et al state that client can be any computer system thus meeting a kiosk.

4. Claims 38-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dilger, Karen Abramic ("Asset management, maintenance redefined), Manufacturing Systems, v15n7, pp. 122-128, July 2997, CODEN: MASYES< ISSN: 0748-948X, JRNL CODE: MFS, Dialog file 15, Accession No. 01493159 and/or McGovern et al (5,918,207).

As per claims 38 and 45, Dilger discusses many asset management systems wherein a central database stores information on various assets held by an organization. Users of the organization access a website hosted by at least one server and transmit a service request to the

server. See pages 3-7 of the reference. Thus, Dilger discusses receiving a service request at the website for an asset. Dilger does not explicitly teach the steps of automatically selecting an appropriate service provider based on the asset to be serviced and generating an electronic message to the appropriate service provider requesting the service. The Examiner notes that such a step would have been obvious to introduce in the system of Dilger in order to appropriately select a service provider with the proper skill and knowledge capable of servicing the request, thereby providing a much faster rendering of the needed service.

Alternatively, one of ordinary skill in the art would have turned to the teachings of McGovern et al for the teachings of the automatic selection of a service provider capable of fulfilling a service request. See the abstract of McGovern et al. McGovern et al teach a system and method which automatically select a service worker capable of fulfilling a service request based on the information obtained from the service request. See column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 41.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings discussed in Dilger with the teachings McGovern et al in order to devise a method and system for appropriately selecting a service provider with the proper skill and knowledge capable of servicing a request, thereby providing a much faster rendering of the service request.

As per claim 39, the combined teachings above do not explicitly recite the additional steps of creating a log listing service requests and generating additional electronic messages to the service provider if no response has been forthcoming. Such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do in the combined teachings above to reassert the needs of the

desired service requests to the service provider, thereby noting the urgency of the desired service..

As per claim 40, in the combination above, the electronic message is an E-mail.

As per claim 41, the combined teaching above does not explicitly state the additional step of attaching asset information onto the E-mail. Such would have been obvious to do by the ordinary skill in the art to do in the combination above in order to inform the service provider of malfunctions of the asset to be serviced so as to expedite repairs of the asset.

As per claim 42, the combination above does not explicitly teach attaching a link to a web page onto the E-mail. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to attach a link to a web page onto the E-mail in the combined teachings above in order to provide the service with sources where further information regarding the asset may be found so as to expedite repairs of the asset.

As per claims 43 and 44, receiving a service report at the website from the service provider would have been obvious to do in the combination above so as to provide service or repairs made regarding the asset. Storing asset information in the service report under an appropriate factor would have also been obvious to do in the combination above in order to acknowledge all services made on a particular asset and also to enable easy access and retrieval of such a record.

Applicant's arguments regarding that Neither Dilger or McGovern teaches the invention of claims 38 and 45 are not convincing. It is clearly taught that both Dilger and McGovern disclose the invention as claimed. Dilger clearly teaches an asset management system for managing a plurality of assets of one or more enterprises. McGovern et al teach a system and

method which automatically select a service worker capable of fulfilling a service request based on the information obtained from the service request. See column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 41 of McGovern.

5. As per the Declaration of Dr. Estrem, it is noted that the Declaration does not show any ties between the claimed invention and the assertion submitted in the Declaration. Thus, there is not a convincing showing of Non-Obviousness.

Furthermore, it should be noted that in the showing of obviousness, the prior art must firstly be considered. The Declaration is considered as secondary considerations and does not give rise to unexpected results.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantzy Poinvil whose telephone number is (571) 272-6797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantzy Poinvil
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3628

FP
February 1, 2006